

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed November 8, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks are made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-20 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 6, 8, and 15 stand rejected. Claims 4, 5, 7, 9-14, and 16-20 stand objected to.

The rejection of Claims 1, 2, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 2, and 15 have been amended to address the issues noted in the Office Action. Specifically, the Office Action asserts on page 2 that it is unclear from the claim whether the recitation "...air.." is referring back to the compressed air from the gas turbine noise suppression system or to the discharge air from the tubes. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite that the term "air" refers to compressed air channeled from the gas turbine engine. In addition, the Office Action asserts that the Claim as written fails to positively recite the relationship/connection between the noise suppression system and the plurality of tubes. Accordingly, Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a noise suppression system comprising a manifold and a plurality of tubes". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 satisfies the requirements of Section 112.

Similarly, Claim 2 has been amended to more clearly recite the subject matter claimed as the invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 2 satisfies the requirements of Section 112.

The Office Action asserts on page 3 that it is unclear from the claim whether the recitation "...to said gas turbine nozzle..." is referring back to the fan nozzle or to the core nozzle. Claim 15 has been amended to recite "gas turbine nozzle". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 15 satisfies the requirements of Section 112.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 112 rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 15 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 8 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jean-Henri Bertin et al. (France Patent No. 1.157.063) (“Bertin”) is respectfully traversed.

Bertin describes a gas turbine engine (7) that includes a plurality of tubes (6) coupled to a nozzle (2). The tubes (6) are oriented such that air discharged from the tubes is directed divergently away from the horizontal plane. Notably, Bertin does not describe nor suggest orienting a plurality of tubes such that air discharged from the plurality of tubes forms a vortex.

Claim 1 recites a method for operating a gas turbine engine, wherein the method includes “positioning a noise suppression system comprising a manifold and a plurality of tubes . . . coupling one end of each of the plurality of tubes to the manifold and coupling an opposite end of each of the plurality of tubes to the nozzle . . . channeling compressed air from the gas turbine engine to the noise suppression system through the manifold . . . selectively operating the noise suppression system such that compressed air is distributed substantially uniformly among the plurality of tubes . . . and orienting the plurality of tubes such that air discharged from the plurality of tubes forms a vortex.”

Bertin does not describe nor suggest a method for operating a gas turbine engine as is recited in Claim 1. Specifically, Bertin does not describe nor suggest a gas turbine engine which includes a plurality of tubes that are oriented such that air discharged from the plurality of tubes forms a vortex. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Bertin describes a gas turbine engine that includes a plurality of tubes oriented such that the air discharged from the tubes diverges away from the horizontal plane. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Bertin.

Claims 2, 3, and 6 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitation of Claim 2, 3, and 6 are considered in combination with the recitation of Claim 1, Applicants submit that Claim 2, 3, and 6 likewise are patentable over Bertin.

Claim 8 recites an assembly for a gas turbine engine including “a gas turbine nozzle... a noise suppression system coupled to said gas turbine nozzle, said noise suppression system comprising a manifold and a plurality of tubes, said plurality of tubes are azimuthally coupled to said gas turbine nozzle, each of said plurality of tubes comprises a first end coupled to said manifold and a second end coupled to said gas turbine nozzle such that said plurality of tubes each extend away from said manifold and are oriented such that air discharged from said plurality of tubes forms a vortex....”

Bertin does not describe nor suggest an assembly for a gas turbine engine, as is recited in Claim 8. Specifically, Bertin does not describe nor suggest a gas turbine engine which includes a plurality of tubes that are oriented such that air discharged from the plurality of tubes forms a vortex. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Bertin describes a gas turbine engine that includes a plurality of tubes oriented such that, the air discharged from the tubes diverges away from the horizontal plane. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 8 is submitted to be patentable over Bertin.

Claim 15 recites a gas turbine engine including “a gas turbine nozzle . . . and a noise suppression system comprising a manifold and a plurality of tubes, said plurality of tubes are azimuthally coupled to said gas turbine nozzle, each of said plurality of tubes comprises an upstream end coupled to said manifold and a downstream end coupled to said gas turbine nozzle, said plurality of tubes each extend away from said manifold, and are oriented such that air discharged from said plurality of tubes forms a vortex....”

Bertin does not describe nor suggest a gas turbine engine, as is recited in Claim 15. Specifically, Bertin does not describe nor suggest a gas turbine engine which includes a noise suppression system further including a plurality of tubes that are oriented such that the air discharged from the plurality of tubes forms a vortex. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Bertin describes a gas turbine engine that includes a plurality of tubes oriented

such that the air discharged from the tubes diverges away from the horizontal plane. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 15 is submitted to be patentable over Bertin.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request the Section 102(b) rejection of Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 8 and 15 be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 5, 7, 9-14, and 16-20 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


Claims 4, 5, and 7 depend from independent Claim 1 which Applicants respectfully submit is in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 4, 5, and 7 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 4, 5 and 7 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Claims 9-14 depend from independent Claim 8 which Applicants respectfully submit is in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 9-14 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 8, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 9-14 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Claims 16-20 depend from independent Claim 15 which Applicants respectfully submit is in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 16-20 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 15, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 16-20 are likewise in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Robert B. Reeser, III  
Reg. No.: 45,548  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740  
(314) 621-5070